

1 McGREGOR W. SCOTT  
2 United States Attorney  
3 ANGELA SCOTT  
4 Assistant United States Attorney  
5 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
6 Fresno, CA 93721  
7 Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
8 Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

9  
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
11 United States of America

12  
13  
14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
17 Plaintiff,  
18 v.  
19 JOSE EDEN LANDEROS, and  
20 ISRAEL MUNGUA-MUNOZ,  
21 Defendants.

22 CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00214 DAD-BAM  
23 STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE  
24 TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;  
25 AND ORDER  
26 CURRENT HEARING DATE: January 27, 2021  
27 TIME: 1:00 p.m.  
28 PROPOSED HEARING DATE: April 28, 2021  
COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

29 This case is set for status conference on January 27, 2021. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued  
30 General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California until further  
31 notice, and allows district judges to continue all criminal matters. This, previous, and subsequent  
32 General Orders were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

33 Although the General Orders address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has  
34 emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act's end-of-justice provision "counteract[s] substantive  
35 openendedness with procedural strictness," "demand[ing] on-the-record findings" in a particular case.  
36 *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). "[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no  
37 exclusion under" § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at  
38 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a  
39 judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record "either orally  
40 or in writing").

1       Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory  
2 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, and 617 require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice  
3 continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that  
4 the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the  
5 defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless  
6 “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the  
7 ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and  
8 the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics, natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).<sup>1</sup> If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

## STIPULATION

24 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant JOSE  
25 EDEN LANDEROS, by and through defendant's counsel of record, Hristo Bijev, defendant ISRAEL  
26 MUNGUIA-MUNOZ, by and through defendant's counsel of record, David Torres, seek a continuance

<sup>1</sup> The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D. Cal. March 18, 2020).

1 of the current status conference to April 28, 2021 and hereby stipulate as follows:

2       1. By previous order, this matter was set for status on January 27, 2021.

3       2. By this stipulation, defendants now move to continue the status conference until April 28,  
4 2021, and to exclude time between January 27, 2021, and April 28, 2021, under Local Codes T2 and T4.

5       3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

6           a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case  
7 includes over 11,000 pages of Bates stamped discovery and several months of wiretap  
8 recordings. All of this discovery has been either produced directly to counsel and/or made  
9 available for inspection and copying.

10          b) Counsel for defendants desire additional time to consult with their clients, to  
11 review the current charges, to conduct investigation and research related to the charges, to review  
12 and copy discovery for this matter, to discuss potential resolutions with their clients, to prepare  
13 pretrial motions, and to otherwise prepare for trial.

14          c) Counsel for defendants believe that failure to grant the above-requested  
15 continuance would deny them the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into  
16 account the exercise of due diligence.

17          d) The government does not object to the continuance.

18          e) Additionally, given the voluminous discovery and the fact that this case involved  
19 a wiretap investigation, it is so complex that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for  
20 pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself prior to April 28, 2021.

21          f) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the  
22 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the  
23 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

24          g) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,  
25 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of January 27, 2021 to April 28,  
26 2021, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code  
27 T4] and 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(ii) [Local Code T2], because it results from a continuance  
28 granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of

1 justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in  
2 a speedy trial.

3 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the  
4 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial  
5 must commence.

6 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

7  
8 Dated: January 13, 2021

McGREGOR W. SCOTT  
United States Attorney

9  
10 /s/ ANGELA SCOTT  
11 ANGELA SCOTT  
12 Assistant United States Attorney

13 Dated: January 13, 2021

14 /s/ per email authorization  
15 Hristo Bijev  
Counsel for Defendant  
16 JOSE EDEN LANDEROS

17 Dated: January 13, 2021

18 /s/ per email authorization  
19 DAVID TORRES  
Counsel for Defendant  
ISRAEL MUNGUA-MUNOZ

20  
21 **ORDER**

22 IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference is continued from January 27, 2021, to **April 28,**  
23 **2021, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe.** Time is excluded pursuant to 18  
U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) and 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(ii).

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: January 13, 2021

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe

26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE